

KLAMATH RIVER BASIN FISHERIES TASK FORCE MEETING

June 23 - 24, 2004

Shilo Inn

Klamath Falls, Oregon

DRAFT MINUTES

June 23, 2004

Membership Attendance:

California Commercial Salmon Fishing Industry	Glen Spain (alternate)
California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG)	Neil Manji
California In-River Sport Fishing Community	Not represented
Del Norte County	Chuck Blackburn
Hoopla Valley Tribe	Not represented
Humboldt County	Not represented
Karuk Tribe	Ron Reed
Klamath County	Steve West
Klamath Tribes	Elwood Miller (alternate), Vice Chair
National Marine Fisheries Service (NOAA Fisheries)	Irma Lagomarsino
Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW)	Keith Wilkinson
Siskiyou County	Marcia Armstrong
Trinity County	Not represented
U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA)	Julie Perrochet (alternate)
U.S. Department of the Interior (DOI)	John Engbring, Chair
Yurok Tribe	Dave Hillemeier

Agendum 1. Convene and opening remarks. John Engbring, Chair. Vice Chair is Elwood Miller, Klamath Tribes. Vice Chair for next meeting will be Allen Foreman

John Engbring called the meeting to order and reminded everyone that there are only six more Klamath Task Force meetings. He touched on the Reauthorization Committee and how it was deactivated after the Solicitor stated that Federal funds cannot be used to influence legislation. John Engbring brought up the importance of team work and how the consensus process is difficult at times but has its benefits because it makes members think about other member's thoughts before moving forward. He asked that as the Task Force work on motions that they please be as creative as possible when offering alternative language. He encouraged everyone to attend the social hour and the field trip to A-Canal.

Agendum 2. Introductions of Congressional staff in attendance

No congressional staff in attendance.

Agendum 3. Business

a. Approval of minutes

Marcia Armstrong provided Laurie Simons with edits to the February meeting minutes.

**Motion by Steve West to approve the February minutes with edits provided by Marcia Armstrong.
Seconded by Marcia Armstrong.**

**Abstentions by Keith Wilkinson, Elwood Miller, and Neil Manji.
Motion passed unanimously.**

b. Adoption of agenda

John Engbring mentioned that Randy Brown will not be attending the meeting and will not give a presentation at 8 AM on Thursday. No other changes were made to the agenda.

**Motion by Keith Wilkinson to adopt the agenda.
Seconded by Glen Spain.
Motion passed unanimously.**

c. Report on Draft Addenda to the Long Range Plan resulting from Task Force review of recommendations from Mid-term Evaluation (Dave Hillemeier and Laurie Simons)

John Engbring stated that the Task Force has been working to approve revisions to the Long Range Plan for the past three years. It was completed at the last meeting and Staff was to update the Plan with the agreed upon revisions. Dave Hillemeier said the Mid-term Evaluation was completed in April 1999 and the Mid-term Evaluation Oversight Subcommittee made recommendations to the Task Force on whether to accept or reject each recommendation from the evaluation. As time allowed, the Task Force then decided how to respond to each recommendation. The first agenda 3c handout lists the agreed upon revisions to Chapter 8 of the Long Range Plan. The second agenda 3c handout is Chapter 8 without any modifications. The third agenda 3c handout is Chapter 8 with the revisions incorporated. The subcommittee recommends that these be incorporated as addenda to the Long Range Plan. The first and third handouts will be incorporated as addenda. Neil Manji asked if these changes were submitted to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC). Laurie Simons said she will submit the revisions to FERC.

Assignment: Staff will email the revisions to the Long Range Plan to Task Force members and Kier and Associates to incorporate into their web copy of the Long Range Plan. The Addenda will also be submitted to FERC for their Klamath Project relicensing process.

d. Suggestion that the Task Force consider regularly agendaizing presentations from timber, farming, and fisher communities to air concerns (Chuck Blackburn)

John Engbring said that Chuck Blackburn had asked for this agenda item to be considered at the last meeting. Chuck Blackburn said this request stemmed from various discussions he has had with different groups. There seems to be an increased interest in the fact that this Task Force could come to an end and these folks might be able to provide a different perspective on some of the Task Force's accomplishments. John Engbring encouraged Task Force members who have contacts with various groups to ask them to make presentations to the Task Force on their industry. They discussed the importance of transparent processes for public participation and the need for structure to these presentations. Task Force members discussed the need for increased community outreach through media outlets. Laurie Simons suggested that Task Force members solicit presenters they think would be beneficial to the Task Force. The Task Force decided that through Laurie, they would consider presentation proposals from groups and individuals.

Agendum 4. Brief review of last meeting actions/general correspondence/program update (Laurie Simons)

Laurie Simons, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), reported on the status of the February meeting assignments and motions. All assignments have been completed and are on this agenda for update or discussion. She then referred to an agenda 4 handout from Jim Bowers, U. S. Geological Survey (USGS), stating that funding for the Salmon River gauge is lacking for fiscal year 2005. Julie Perrochet reported that she understood the Salmon River gauge was recently taken

offline due to lack of funding. The Forest Service had funded it in years past, but this funding is no longer available. The Task Force requested that staff draft a letter in support of funding this gauge.

Motion by Dave Hillemeier for staff to draft a letter to USGS requesting full funding for the Salmon River gauge, with copies to California Department of Water Resources (DWR) and U. S. Forest Service (USFS). The letter should identify cost sharing options for DWR and USGS.
Seconded by Glen Spain.
Motion passed unanimously.

Agendum 5. Brief Updates and Announcements

a. Update on State coho recovery process (Neil Manji)

Neil Manji reported that the Fish and Game Commission is meeting in Crescent City to consider adopting the proposed changes to coho as a threatened and endangered species. The Commission is meeting to determine if the full package will go forward. If so, the coho would be threatened in the upper portion of the Klamath River and endangered in the lower portion of the river. Hearings will occur this Friday and there is a lot of interest. Glen Spain asked if California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) is commenting on the Trinity Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). Neil said CDFG has prepared a letter with comments.

b. Update on Shasta-Scott Recovery Team (Neil Manji)

Neil Manji reported that this recovery team is tied into the overall coho listing. They completed their plan, but not much will happen in terms of coho recovery until the Commission task is completed.

c. Update on NOAA coho recovery planning (Irma Lagomarsino)

Irma Lagomarsino stated that a presentation on the recovery process was given at the Lower Basin Science Conference. They are coming up with interim criteria for modeling because data on coho abundance are not available now. Dave Hillemeier added that progress has been made with modeling efforts to help determine functionally independent and dependent populations. Irma Lagomarsino said they are discussing initiating phase two. There are a lot of restoration efforts out there and we are trying to integrate them into the recovery process.

d. Update on NOAA hatchery listing policy (Irma Lagomarsino)

Irma Lagomarsino reported that the NOAA Fisheries hatchery listing policy was published on June 3rd and public comments are being accepted until September (see informational handout). She defined the policy and said it will be used in listing determinations for salmonids to better account for hatchery fish. It is a five point policy that evaluates listing determinations for salmonids under the Endangered Species Act considering things like how divergent hatchery populations are from the wild forms, a status review process looking at four key population attributes (abundance, productivity, spatial distribution, and genetic divergence), and recognition that hatchery fish play an important role to trust and treaty purposes.

Agendum 6. Report from the Technical Work Group: progress on Task Force assignments (Petey Brucker)

a. Prioritized list of project proposals for 2005 funding

Petey Brucker reported that the Technical Work Group (TWG) prioritized project proposals for 2005 funding (see agendum 6a handout). It is apparent that the sub-basins are honing in on priority projects. There were 40 proposals, the TWG recommends funding 1/3 of them.

b. Sub-basin planning summary

Petey Brucker reported that the sub-basin plans are progressing. The TWG just reviewed another draft of the Scott River plan and the draft mid-Klamath plan by the Karuk Tribe. The Shasta plan is coming along, but they are also spending time working on the coho plan. The Salmon River and Lower Basin plans are complete and being implemented. The Salmon River is drafting a limiting factors analysis for the spring Chinook (see agendum 6a handout).

c. Mainstem Sub-basin Planning: Need Task Force decision/direction on how to move forward on Mainstem issues (Handout)

Petey Brucker referred to his handout (see agendum 6a handout). He said the TWG was tasked with coming up with a process for a Mainstem Sub-basin Plan. The basin is a big geographic area with a lot of stakeholders. There is a lack of time if we need to finish this before the Klamath Act expires. The TWG is split because it is a huge undertaking and we need good direction from the Task Force. Petey Brucker referred to item c in the handout which is the TWG's outline of issues and actions to summarize what the plan should address. He continued that the Lower Klamath Sub-basin Plan covers the lower basin tributaries and not the mainstem. The Task Force identified the mainstem as its own sub-basin. The Salmon River Sub-basin Restoration Plan identified that the main impacts are coming from outside of the basin. There seems to be a real need for coordination. He summarized that the action was for the TWG to recommend if the Task Force should construct a mainstem plan and the Task Force needs to vote on that.

John Engbring thanked the TWG for their work. It appears that the big question is the issue of a mainstem plan and if the Task Force should move forward with that kind of plan. He thinks there is a fair amount of coordination on the mainstem.

The Task Force discussed the possibility of a mainstem sub-basin plan. Dave Hillemeier stated that a mainstem project would be huge. It may be useful to ask for proposals in the next request for proposals to identify all of the mainstem issues, the potential effects of the issues on restoration, and list the studies that have been conducted or are being conducted regarding those issues. John Engbring said a list of what is going on out there would be a useful starting point. Julie Perrochet said we know what the issues are, but the entire mainstem is too big. Developing lists would be beneficial. Irma Lagomarsino added that it would be nice to have an interim placeholder plan for the basin to help get a handle on what is going on out there right now.

Glen Spain suggested looking at the coho recovery strategy developed by the Fish and Game Commission. A number of actions are recommended and they might be in line with what the Task Force wants to do. Petey Brucker said the TWG does look closely at the recovery plans.

John Engbring stated that he doesn't sense that the Task Force is willing to embark on a large mainstem plan, but would possibly support an effort to detail the current activities going on in the basin. He proposed that Julie Perrochet and Dave Hillemeier put that list together tonight for the Task Force to vote on at the October meeting. For now, the TWG should not embark on a major effort.

Mainstem Plan Outline Developed by Dave Hillemeier and Julie Perrochet

Dave Hillemeier distributed a Mainstem Plan outline that he and Julie Perrochet developed (see agendum 6c handout). He explained that the plan should include a list of things that can affect fisheries down to the ocean. Also included should be a list of existing and ongoing studies. This is a subset of what a mainstem plan should consist of. Julie Perrochet added that the TMDL process contributes a lot of water quality information. The timing of their process should be considered.

Petey Brucker stated that it is important to identify where these items originated from in order to go back and look at the original language (sub-basin plan, NRC Report, tribes, etc). The group discussed the need for coordination with the Upper Basin Working Group on some of the big ticket restoration recommendations. There is a concern that the big ticket restoration recommendations require concurrence with several entities throughout the basin. This is simply a list of issues that are affecting the resources, and will not include restoration recommendations. The group edited the document to reflect concerns brought up by Task Force members.

Assignment: Staff will include an edited version of the Draft Mainstem Sub-basin Plan Outline provided by Dave Hillemeier and Julie Perrochet on the October agenda for Task Force members to consider as an assignment to the TWG or an RFP to fund in the next funding cycle.

Agendum 7. Report from Klamath Watershed Coordination Group (Neil Manji and Dave Hillemeier)

No update given.

Klamath Basin Compact Commission (Alice Kilham)

Alice Kilham, Klamath Compact Commission, reported that Phillip Ward is the new Oregon Commissioner. She reported on the ongoing work of the webpage and the need for good mid-basin maps. She urged people to attend the "Beyond Crisis to Consensus" workshop July 14-16 at the Marble Mountain Guest Ranch. The goal of the retreat is to find a common voice for this river basin in order to get funding and go forward with a united plan. The Commission is trying to do as much outreach as possible to humanize the river. Steve West added that Bob Chadwick, the facilitator for this workshop, has some great tools. Ron Reed added that Stanshaw Creek is in Karuk Country and was a very controversial area, but we've turned the page on this and have secured some funding for restoration efforts, which will help create some harmony.

Upper Klamath Basin Working Group (Jim Carpenter)

Jim Carpenter, Upper Klamath Basin Working Group, reported that they are overseeing the watershed assessment and hope to have the upper Williamson draft available soon. There has been a lot of outreach and the work has been subcontracted. The working group has been coming up with a short list of agreed to restoration projects that will hopefully result in some funding. They are high profile projects with a science committee to sign off on them. The coordination group signed a memorandum of agreement years ago and it hasn't been implemented. We haven't taken advantage of Hatfield's intention. We will be taking another look at the coordination group between now and 2006. The role of the coordination group could be to determine how to look at the Klamath as one watershed. Structurally, the group would be different. There would be one-day decision-making meetings quarterly to move along more effectively. In the meantime, the reauthorization committee and the restoration committee are meeting regularly. He asked the Task Force what they thought of the coordination group idea. Marcia Armstrong brought up the idea of teleconferencing and how it might be a good way to bring the upper and lower basin together. Jim Carpenter mentioned a list serve and website as methods for keeping in touch. Dave Hillemeier reminded the group about the Salmon Coalition list serve and the Klamath-Trinity list serve. The Upper Basin Working Group website is: <http://www.klamathgroup.org>.

Agendum 8. Presentation on the Trinity River Restoration Program: How it functions and recent issues (Doug Schleusner, Bureau of Reclamation)

Doug Schleusner, Bureau of Reclamation (BOR), reported on the Trinity River Restoration Program functions and the top three issues to date, which include, managed flow regime, adaptive environmental assessment and management, and mechanical channel rehabilitation. The restoration program is linked to the Record of Decision (ROD) and flow evaluation study. The basic premise of the flow study is to see an increase in smolt production by increasing the amount

of rearing habitat three to four times of what it currently is. The program does not try to engineer rearing habitat; the goal is to open up the channel and let the river recreate the rearing habitat itself. There have been many regulatory hurdles to cross and some land ownership issues. The focus is a 40 mile system-wide approach. The ROD schedule is ambitious with the hope of having 24 sites completed by 2007 or 2008. Doug Schleusner continued that the flow study is based on the water year type and volumes associated with that and hydrographs that are typically used as a starting point. Over the past four years, there has been a substantial increase in the water released. He showed a diagram that outlined the Trinity River Restoration Program organization and discussed how they function as a group.

Questions: Marcia Armstrong said the downriver projects had to be changed because of the Scott River flood and work had to be done higher in the watershed to limit changes in the basin. She asked about the anticipation of a natural flow event washing the sediment out. Doug Schleusner replied that the hope is for a dynamic alluvial channel. Chuck Blackburn asked if the restoration program is considering late August-October for additional water for fish during that crucial time of year because he recalls natural events that used to occur. Doug Schleusner replied that the release last fall was a one-time event, but it is possible that a similar event may occur. There wasn't a call for regular releases in the original EIS. Flood events did occur then, but they were not frequent. Doug Schleusner reported that the supplemental EIS comment period has been extended into July. The supplement was originally scheduled to be complete by July 9th, but now the date is November 23rd with a ROD by the end of the calendar year. Ron Reed stated that the Trinity River Restoration Program is taking credit for stimulating spawning migration. The Karuk Tribe monitored that and he thinks the weather year was different than previous years. He asked if the Trinity River Restoration Program is monitoring the effects of the pulse flow above the Trinity-Klamath confluence. Doug Schleusner said yes, the report is included as a technical appendix in the EIS, but the monitoring is going on upstream on the Trinity, not the Klamath. Ron Reed said the Karuk Tribe is interested in participating in the monitoring.

Agendum 9. Public comment

Peter Townley, Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS), asked Neil Manji if CDFG has approved the Shasta-Scott Recovery Team Plan (SSRT). Neil Manji replied that a portion of the recovery has been melded into the state's overall recovery plan, which has been accepted by the Commission. Peter Townley asked if this would create an opportunity for CDFG to streamline the process. Neil Manji replied that part of that will be discussed if the Commission accepts it as a listed species, but yes, that will be discussed. He will give a presentation on the permitting process for agriculture at the October Task Force meeting. Peter Townley asked Irma Lagomarsino if she foresees the same thing for NOAA Fisheries. Irma Lagomarsino said they are not quite as far along and it doesn't include every last thing that the recovery plan does. Stakeholders have not completely adopted the SSRT Plan because they are concerned with the take permit. Marcia Armstrong added that the recovery strategy is a voluntary strategy. The programmatic take permit has been submitted to the application.

Jim Henderson, Karuk Tribe, stated that the Salmon River flow gauge represents the longest continuous flow data in the country. The Karuk Tribe maintains the Indian Creek gauge and might be able to help with the Salmon River gauge. He continued that the Task Force should be more involved in the FERC relicensing process because the dams represent the single most disruptive thing to fish passage on the river. The collaborative process with PacifiCorp has failed. He asked that Task Force members please look at the Karuk Tribe's Final License Application comments for more detail. Jim Henderson asked if the Task Force will supply comments to the BOR EIS. Laurie Simons replied that they have not worked on scoping comments. Jim Henderson said comments from the Task Force as a whole would be more meaningful. Glen Spain said the April 23rd letter from the Task Force is on the record and should be sufficient. This doesn't mean we shouldn't encourage people to get scoping comments in. Jim Henderson added that it is a coincidence that the Task Force and PacifiCorp's license expire in 2006. It would be really terrible if the Task Force is not around if the dams are relicensed.

Agendum 10. Planning for Klamath Project Operations and status of the Conservation Implementation Program, (Christine Karas, Bureau of Reclamation)

Christine Karas, BOR, stated that in-flows to Upper Klamath Lake have dropped to 440cfs and continue to fall. The flow into the project is about 1,100cfs with some other pumping under water bank contracts. This year there was a competitive process to create a water market. There were also option contracts that allowed people to pump water on demand. Unfortunately, everyone is pumping and exercising their option contracts. She continued that the plans of the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) in conjunction with BOR to remove Chiloquin Dam are moving forward. About 70-80% of sucker spawning habitat would open up without that dam. There is a field hearing in Klamath Falls on July 17th with the House Resources Committee to investigate impacts of ESA on the Klamath project. BOR is anticipating the release of the draft Tom Perry report in mid-July. We'd like to have a meeting with the review committee before August. There will be further delay if this meeting does not occur.

Christine Karas reported that CDM has been hired as the contractor for the Conservation Implementation Program (CIP). We are currently discussing the schedule for public meetings throughout the basin. CDM will help facilitate the meetings and try to compile the existing plans for restoration and activities going on. We want to start compiling a massive list of items that the CIP could support in some fashion and hope to have a final draft document by the end of the year with stakeholders signed up for various committees.

Agendum 11. Presentation on Iron Gate Hatchery tagging and mitigation numbers (Todd Olson, PacifiCorp; and Neil Manji, California Department of Fish and Game)

Linda Prendergast, PacifiCorp, reported that PacifiCorp proposed to raise the fractional marking rate at Iron Gate Hatchery to 25% in the next licensing period. This will help CDFG manage the fisheries in the basin. This proposal has been endorsed by entities such as the Task Force and CDFG. Neil Manji discussed the agendum 11 handouts. The first handout (see agendum 11 handout, IGH Adult Chinook Returns 1962-2003) shows how adult spawning returns have increased since implementation of the yearling program (where juveniles are released at larger sizes). The second handout (see agendum 11 handout, Iron Gate Hatchery Production Goals and Restraints) outlines Iron Gate Hatchery mitigation goals. Neil Manji indicated that Kim Rushton was present and has good background information on the hatchery. The last handout (see agendum 11 handout, Opinion No. 381 Pacific Power & Light Company) is an opinion of the Federal Power Commission on Iron Gate Hatchery mitigation goals from the Supreme Court decisions. Neil then stated that there are 90,000 fish being raised in the yearling program at Iron Gate Hatchery, and Fall Creek Hatchery is not being operated this year.

Neil Manji continued that PacifiCorp's proposed increase in marking rates will mark 25% of the fish with coded wired tags, similar to the Trinity River Hatchery. This will significantly improve harvest management, understanding stray issues, and in understanding the contribution of hatchery fish to the ocean harvest. Increased marking will make working with the data much easier. Neil Manji asked if PacifiCorp is planning to pay for the increased operation and maintenance costs. Linda Prendergast said the initial purchase of the marking equipment will be made and probably a portion of the operation and maintenance costs. Neil Manji continued that the license issuance might be delayed and therefore, the constant fractional marking would be delayed. He said the Task Force should do what they can to sway all entities to step up and get this program going sooner.

Irma asked if PacifiCorp could start doing the 25% tagging next year because it seems to be a top priority. Linda Prendergast said that PacifiCorp will not purchase the marking equipment until after the license is issued because it is a very large investment.

Neil Manji stated that there is an early release program going on this year to try to get the fish spread out in the river and it seems to be successful. Data is already being analyzed. Constant fractional marking will improve these types of studies.

Dave Hillemeier added that the goal of marking is to document hatchery-natural interactions, so it is appropriate for PacifiCorp to fund some of the monitoring that takes place such as the Bogus Creek monitoring. Steve West disagreed with PacifiCorp's decision to defer increased marking until after their license is issued. It would be a good faith effort on PacifiCorp's part to go ahead to start 25% marking. Ron Reed said there are marking rentals available that PacifiCorp could use before purchasing the equipment. Dave Hillemeier said there is also the potential for sharing the cost with other hatcheries.

Agendum 12. Report on outcomes of the Lower Klamath River Basin Science Conference (Irma Lagomarsino)

John Engbring said the Lower Klamath River Basin Science Conference was a great success. Irma Lagomarsino complimented Dave Hillemeier for being on the steering committee and giving three talks. Doug Schleusner helped a lot also. In February, the Task Force decided that they wanted to support a lower basin science conference and worked with USGS, California Water Board, CDFG and others to get it off the ground by June. USGS took care of a lot of the logistics. The goal of the conference was to present the current state of the science of anadromous fish and their habitat and to identify research needs. We hope to have a series of conferences to address other species. Irma Lagomarsino listed some of the panels and presentations and said that they were all very successful. The independent scientific review panel gave a good summary of the week on the final day of the conference. Top priority science needs were identified by participants and will be entered into a database and then synthesized from there to identify the top needs. Overall, there was a lot of positive feedback and it was a success. The conference was recorded and copies can be obtained through Walt Duffy (USGS) or Tim McKay from the North Coast Environmental Center.

Agendum 13. Progress of development of the Collier Rest Area Interpretive Displays (Bob Rice)

Bob Rice, Collier Interpretive and Information Center, stated that work on the Collier Rest Area Interpretive Display has been ongoing since 1989. A lot of time has been spent with Siskiyou County and nine cities in the County pursuing the finances to develop this center. Cal Trans owns the rest area and has been an ultimate partner throughout. Our mission at Collier has followed two themes: to enhance local and regional economy by finding ways to bring people off of Interstate 5, and to be able to authentically communicate interpretive messages about the culture and history of the Klamath watershed. The center opened one year ago and 75,000 people have visited so far. We expect to receive about \$30,000 this year through brochure sales, which is sufficient to keep us operating. It is a busy rest area and is definitely creating a better understanding of the basin. Bob Rice discussed the different displays they are working to complete, which include four watershed displays and a display dealing with the watershed as a smart classroom with GIS overlay of things in the basin. Ron Reed asked if there is any Native American component to the displays. Bob Rice replied that they have plans to include this, and would appreciate Karuk assistance on the tribal component of the river. Dave Hillemeier suggested contacting Klamath River Intertribal Fish and Water Commission for information and assistance.

Agendum 14. Updates

a. Proposal to prepare Accomplishments Report for Klamath River Basin Conservation Area Restoration Program (Phil Detrich)

Phil Detrich, USFWS, reported that the Task Force discussed compiling an accomplishments report at the February meeting. Staff was directed to come back with options for potential funding and some of those costs were of concern to the Task Force. We currently have two cost options shown in the handouts (see agendum 14 handouts). One option is a shorter accomplishments outline and the other is a longer accomplishments outline. The shorter option is similar to the report that Petey Brucker is working on under an existing agreement. Petey's overview would be used as the foundation and then some elements from the longer outline would be added to it. The budget required to carry out these additional elements would be about \$10,000. The longer accomplishments report is much more thorough and would likely cost about \$50,000. The Budget Committee seems to favor the shorter outline.

John Engbring said that the general group consensus is to have something that the lay person can understand with pictures, charts, and illustrations. The group agreed that the report should be short, accurate, and to the point and that drafts should be reviewed by the Task Force. Neil Manji suggested Staff look at the Trinity Restoration Program brochure completed by McBain & Associates. Doug Schleusner said he will share the Trinity River Restoration accomplishments report with Phil Detrich. John Engbring added that printing costs could be paid for in the 2006 budget.

Assignment: Staff will include the 2006 Budget on the October Task Force meeting agenda for discussion.

b. Klamath River Fish Health Assessment Team Update (Neil Manji)

Neil Manji reported that he ongoing screw trap efforts on the river have started to pick up some sick and dying juvenile salmonids. Multiple agencies and tribes came together to form the Klamath Basin Fish Health Assessment Team and decided that they would be put into operation if there were signs of a fish die-off. Last week, it was decided that CDFG would ask the Klamath Fish Health Assessment Team to go out and do some reconnaissance on the Klamath River, surveying 87 miles. Surveys showed that there aren't many fish at the mouth of the creeks and they are showing some signs of disease (*Ceratomyxa shasta*). He provided a handout of the comments received from survey crews. The tribes and monitoring agencies have been seeing signs of weak fish for a few months now. John Engbring said this is the first year this has been done and it is therefore somewhat of a baseline because no one knows what previous years were like. Ron Reed added that crews looking at thermal refugia have said that the recent weather patterns have been helping the situation.

Agendum 15. Report from Budget Committee on proposed 2005 Work Plan

Phil Detrich, USFWS, said there are two budget issues the Task Force needs to deal with. One is the 2005 budget (see revised agendum 15 handout). He explained that he requested an additional \$20,000 for Administration in the 2005 budget from the Budget Committee last November. In February, we thought that additional funds were unnecessary, but as of now the additional funds are needed due to a projected overall budget reduction of 4%. Therefore, in the 2005 budget, \$558,700 will go to projects and \$441,300 toward administrative costs.

Phil Detrich asked that Task Force members look at the list of proposed projects (see agendum 6a handout). The following describes the projects recommended for funding by the Budget Committee. In Category 1, we would fund E-05, HR-02, HR-01, HR-04 (reduced by \$5,000), and HR-03. In Category 2, we would fund the five sub-basins equally at \$25,000 each: PC-01, PC-02, PC-05, PC-06, and PC-04. Category 3 projects to be funded are: FP-16, FP-07, FP-03, FP-14, FP-10, FP-11 (modified to \$33,255), FP-09, FP-05 (reduced by \$5,000), FP-01, FP-06, and FP-12 (reduced to \$50,000). John Engbring asked where the \$10,000 for the accomplishment report would come from. Phil Detrich said HR-04 and FP-05 will take \$5,000 reductions. John Engbring listed the amount funded for the three categories: \$143,168 for Category 1, \$125,000 for Category 2, and \$280,531 for Category 3.

Phil Detrich then discussed the Draft Budget Expenditures handout (agendum 15 handout). He acknowledged the work of Darla Eastman and Laurie Simons in developing the figures. Expenditures from 1989-2003 were examined and segregated among the following activities: support of Federal committees, program administration, restoration projects, and project management. The meeting management piece is easy to quantify, but the administrative support versus project management is a little more difficult to quantify. The pie charts are the easiest way to compare the numbers. The first pie chart describes how the money was spent on projects and the second pie chart shows administrative costs compared to project funding. He noted that 11% went into this committee, which raises administrative costs. The third pie chart represents where the costs stand today for fiscal year 2003. Phil Detrich asked the Task Force to look at this in more detail and provide comments to him or Laurie Simons sometime in the future. John Engbring added that folks should not underestimate the value of these pie charts because this explains how the Task Force has operated. Steve West said these pie charts need to be included in the accomplishments report.

Agendum 16. Presentation on harvest management by the Klamath Fishery Management Council (Phil Detrich, Dave Bitts, Keith Wilkinson, Dave Hillemeier)

Phil Detrich, USFWS, stated that the Klamath Fishery Management Council (Council) is the other FACA committee funded by the Klamath Act. This presentation deals with how fisheries harvest is managed, which is what the Council deals with. He listed the anadromous fish and the various fisheries that are involved: ocean commercial, ocean recreation, in-river recreation, and in-river tribal.

Keith Wilkinson said the Klamath River Salmon Management Group came together in 1984 because the adult return rates during that time were very low. In 1984, the Pacific Fisheries Management Council (PFMC) decided a group was needed to deal with this. Thus, in 1986, the Klamath River Basin Fishery Restoration Act was passed establishing two advisory committees. The Council membership is slightly different from the Task Force and all entities are involved in the harvest of fish. The function of the Council is to provide a public forum for salmon issues and harvest allocation. The Council makes recommendations about harvest to various bodies such as the California Fish and Game Commission, PFMC, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW), Hoopa and Yurok Tribes. The Technical Advisory Team (TAT) is a sub-committee that conducts analysis of spawning runs, models forecast abundance, and advises the Council.

Keith Wilkinson gave a description of the fisheries species and the mixed stock commercial and ocean recreational fisheries. Closures and constraints are used as a tool to manage the fisheries. Dave Hillemeier gave some background on the anadromous species harvested by the Yurok Tribe. The tribes depend on the fisheries for many reasons and purposes. Dave Hillemeier explained that harvest does not directly correlate with abundance because there are a lot of other things affecting abundance.

Keith Wilkinson said in terms of harvest allocation, prior to 1986, the tribes and ocean fishers went into negotiations for harvest shares (tribes got 50% of anadromous fish). Annual negotiations prior to that were conducted by PFMC, ODFW, and CDFG and allocations were further constrained by other stocks. The allocation is different every year, but approximately 15% of 50% of the non-tribal share goes to the in-river recreation fishery, and 17% of that remainder goes to ocean recreation, and the remainder of that is split between the Oregon and California troll fishery.

Dave Hillemeier discussed the scientific basis for harvest management. The Klamath fall Chinook management goal is to protect natural fish production and it is geared toward harvest rate management. There have only been two years where harvest rate management was practiced, because there aren't high enough return rates most years. He continued that it is an intensive effort to determine how many fish are spawning. There are mark and recapture estimators, video weirs, redd counts, and direct fish counts. He continued that the survey information and scientific work feeds the mega-table that is maintained by CDFG. It is almost an annual struggle to get this funded. All of this work gives us information on the amount of certain age fish and then that is used to predict this year's abundance based on previous year's numbers, which is a difficult prediction. Dave Hillemeier gave some details on the KOHM, the model of each fishery by monthly time step and by area. The new model incorporates natural mortality on a monthly basis as well as other things like out of basin straying and minimum size limits.

Keith Wilkinson explained how the tools get translated into regulation. The post season reports are available in December and by January and February there is accurate return information to compare that to projections. The analytical process gives an idea of the amount of fish available for harvest. Harvest allocation is discussed by the Council at meetings in February, March and April and then recommendations are made to the PFMC. The recommendations are generally accepted by the PFMC.

Questions: Marcia Armstrong asked what the fishermen have to do when there is incidental take. Neil Manji said there is no direct take on those species, so there is an opportunity to fish. There is a process within the biological opinion for angling these species in the ocean. Glen Spain said there is an incidental take at the federal level and virtually nowhere in California is there a directed deliberate harvest of coho allotment. Keith Wilkinson said the same principle applies to

coho as Chinook. He clarified that a directed coho fishery is occurring in state waters under a limited quota for marked fish retention only. It is tied statistically to impact surplus hatchery fish. Phil Detrich added that private individual fishermen are covered by incidental take permits, but other individuals, like landowners, are responsible for getting incidental take permits on their own. For more information go to: www.pacific.fws.gov/yreka.

Agendum 17. Public comment

Dan Keppen, Klamath Water Users Association, mentioned the table circulated earlier by CDFG (see agendum 14b handout). He asked how big the 270 dead fish were. Neil Manji replied that they were 60-90mm. Dan Keppen asked how big the fish just released from Iron Gate Hatchery are. Neil Manji said they are about the same size. He reminded Dan Keppen that only 87 miles of the river were surveyed and some hatchery fish are showing up. Dan Keppen said we need to know how this relates to past years. The absence of this information allows catastrophic theories to prevail. John Engbring added that the number is a representative portion. There is a lot of variation in trying to figure out what is going on. It could be indicating that disease might be as high as other years. Dan Keppen said he would like to caution people in using the term fish kill. Chuck Blackburn agreed that preliminary information gets put on the Times Standard front page and it doesn't serve anybody well. We are all trying to work together here, but the media gets going and makes it hard to work together. Ron Reed said that he'd like to comment that the weather conditions this year are helping, but because we can't quantify this fish die-off effort anyone on the river will tell you that there are fish dying. We have to wait for three to four years to quantify the fish die-off that is going on right now. Lastly, do we need another 30,000 dead fish or another million dead smolt to figure out what the problem is? He doesn't think we do and entities are trying to work together to fix these problems. Elwood Miller added that the purpose of our meeting is to come together to solve problems. This is a good starting point and people shouldn't take this initial information and try to run with it. Neil Manji said one thing CDFG and the assessment team have decided is that all media questions are to go through him and CDFG. We are trying to ease the misconceptions of what is going on out there. It takes a lot of studies to quantify what is going on out there and in the future, those studies will help us determine the natural producers going out, returns, etc. Dave Hillemeier added that the Yurok Tribe has been seeing alarming incidents of disease due to flows ratcheted down and we are desperate to not have the risk of another catastrophe. Dan Keppen asked if it is possible to get a sense of the returning run in order to set something in motion to raise the in-river harvest so that there aren't excess fish (real time monitoring). Neil Manji said that based on returns there are avenues that can be taken that allow for harvest on a real time basis. The key is to get those fish allocated downstream in an earlier fashion, which is almost impossible. The lower reaches are hard to do because we want to protect the lower tributaries fishery.

Marshall Staunton, Upper Klamath Working Group, said he saw some projects in the 2005 recommendations that would be of concern to the upper basin, and provided this information to Petey. He shared some BOR data (agendum 17 handout). The first page shows the Klamath River monthly flows at Keno from 1961-2003. The second page shows the net reduction in Klamath River flows due to agriculture, and the third page shows the net reduction in flows due to refuge use over the same time period. Marshall Staunton provided this information for Staff to distribute.

Peter Townley, NRCS, stated that landowners and agencies are working together. Agencies should pool together to make a single permitting process for implementation of recovery projects. His second comment is to voice concern about the Task Force accomplishments report. In looking through the Long Range Plan it seems that the original goal of the task should be listed in order to show what was accomplished. Without a goal, it feels like credit isn't being received for good work. John Engbring agreed.

June 24, 2004

Agendum 18. Report from Arcata Fish and Wildlife Office on Flow Study and other field studies (Randy Brown)

This report was canceled.

Agendum 19. Klamath River TMDL development status (David Leland, North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board - TMDL Development Unit lead; and Steve Kirk, Oregon Department of Environmental Quality - Klamath Basin Coordinator)

David Leland said the talk he will give today is similar to the talk that was given at the Lower Basin Science Conference. He will focus on the Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) process rather than the definition of a TMDL. A TMDL is a framework or means for assessing the condition of a water body to develop a strategy to attain water quality standards. The 303d listing forces the state to complete a TMDL for a given area. The Klamath Basin TMDL development schedule is driven by a consent decree. He showed the 303d listings and TMDL due dates in the Klamath Basin below Upper Klamath Lake. Roles and responsibilities are established in an MOA between Oregon, EPA, and California. The goal is to cooperatively seek a unified approach to TMDL development in the basin.

David Leland reviewed the definition of a TMDL. Under current conditions, there is a load from natural, non-point sources, and point sources. A TMDL involves a pollution budget and an allocation within certain categories amongst the different contributors. A source analysis is done to calculate load capacity, which establishes a linkage between loading and water quality standards. The source analysis includes water quality sample analysis, assessing the role of aquatic plant community in driving water quality, and assessing land use in the watershed. David Leland described the data collection methods. He stated that there is an obligation to use the best available data. Data collection efforts aren't required, but we typically find that there are important data gaps that need to be addressed, which is currently the case. Additional studies may be required to sort out additional issues.

David Leland described the processes in the Upper Lost River in California above Malone Reservoir, the Lower Lost River, the Klamath River Mainstem, Shasta River, Scott River, and the Salmon River. He then identified science needs for the TMDL process, which include the need for predictive water quality models, a better understanding of the benthic community, a better understanding of the tributary watershed temperatures and the relationship between surface water and groundwater, and information on fisheries lifestage periodicity. There is also an ongoing effort to coordinate all of the data collection efforts going on in the basin.

David Leland reiterated that the TMDL process is a public process. Oregon and California have Klamath TMDL webpage's where information is posted. There will be opportunities for comments on documents being generated from analyses. Websites are: <http://waterquality.deq.state.or.us/wq/> and <http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/~rwqcb1>. Questions: John Engbring asked about the coordination efforts between California and Oregon. David Leland said that the EPA, Oregon, and California are working very well together. Marcia Armstrong stated that the standards are driven by temperature, coldwater fisheries, and rearing requirements; and asked what will be done with the whole system to respond to the temperature requirement that was mentioned at the Lower Basin Science Conference (22°C). David Leland said there is no exact number right now; there is a narrative standard that focuses on natural temperature for beneficial uses. Part of the task is to assemble information on temperature that relates to threshold values of different life stages. The 22°C estimate is only one value of many that will be taken into account. Glen Spain asked about the timing of TMDL process and the hydropower project relicensing. David Leland said the relicensing has a 401 certification that goes along with it and that rests with the state. We are working closely with the California water board and our intent is for the TMDL exercise to be reflected in the 401 process because we see those processes as being linked. If for some reason the 401 is completed before the TMDL there would be some re-opener. They hope the process is complete by the end of 2005 and hope that will be reflected in the license. Glen Spain suggested that the data be part of the public record so that people can look at it. David Leland said that is a good suggestion.

Glen Spain asked what role the Task Force could play as a funding source to the TMDL process. David Leland said the Task Force could help with filling in data gaps. John Engbring asked what happens after the TMDL process is complete. David Leland responded that the technical analysis is coupled with an action plan and creates obligations on our part and

provides a framework for exercising responsibility to the Clean Water Act. Enforcement tools are available, but our goal is to work within the non-point source framework, the first step being to work with the community.

Julie Perrochet asked about the variety of tools coupled with the action plans. Matt St. John, North Coast Water Resources Control Board, responded that is the reason why there is a lot of stakeholder involvement in the action plan development. David Leland added that the technical analysis should be complete by December 2005 and the action plan about one year after that. Matt St. John provided a fact sheet on Klamath Basin TMDLs (see agenda 19 handout).

Agendum 20. Water appropriation issues in the Klamath River Basin in relation to anadromous fisheries restoration (Reed Marbut, Oregon Water Resources Department)

Reed Marbut explained that the appropriation of water in Oregon and California are under the doctrine of prior appropriation, which is set around the concept of individuals being able to secure a property right for a sufficient duration to get a return on their investment. Individuals get the right to use water by documenting beneficial uses with first in time, first in right. The most junior water right often turns out to be the environment. He mentioned the Tribal Trust commitment to the upper basin tribes for water and the commitment to the lower basin tribes for fish, and the massive allocation of Trinity River water out of the basin. The adjudication is not an allocation of water, merely the quantification of existing uses where every individual must prove that they are making beneficial use of what they are using to receive a water right through the court. Reed Marbut said the issue of the Klamath Tribes and the irrigation project is not resolved yet. When it is resolved, the adjudicator will publish findings of fact in an order of determination. Oregon will regulate in accordance with the finding of fact, and then will reallocate the adjudicated water with a published decree of water right, which is subject to appeal through the Oregon court system. He mentioned essential elements that assist in getting to the morally right solutions for the watershed: habitat improvements are needed through restoration activities, water diversions out of streams and rivers need to be improved, more water storage is necessary, and we need to use less water. Reed Marbut continued to talk about consuming less water by irrigating for maximum profit, not maximum crop. He suggested Marshall Flug give a presentation to the Task Force on this idea.

Reed Marbut asked how a century of mismanagement of the anadromous fishery can be undone. He suggested ESA is not the right method for doing this. Incentive should be given and water should be reallocated through a market system. When the adjudication is complete individuals will be able to use their water differently through tax credits for reallocation of water. Oregon asks that consideration be expanded to other areas of the Klamath basin, including the Trinity River, which is diverted to the Central Valley and Southern California. He stated that everyone's goal is to have the hydro project removed in the future.

Questions: Glen Spain said prior appropriation doesn't work because ground water users don't have a surface water allocation. Reed Marbut said this is true in California and not true in Oregon. In Oregon, ground water and surface water are managed conjunctively. They can regulate to stop ground water use if it is depleting surface water. Oregon has started to not allow for additional ground water uses where we show that the two sources are a connected resource. If you own land in California you own water under it and can pump it all you want and it is controlled by the County. California doesn't do conjunctive regulation. Marcia Armstrong clarified that what Reed Marbut said about California water law was incorrect. There is a dual system of water law in California. She said that there are primarily private rights.

Glen Spain asked about the USGS groundwater study. Reed Marbut replied that the study is taking place in the Sprague River area and will be completed in about two years. Glen Spain asked what Oregon is doing about the potential for more groundwater usage given the aquifer is drying up. Reed Marbut said that studies have been completed, but we can't make a preliminary determination. Glen Spain asked about the groundwater permits that are still being granted. Reed Marbut clarified that no new water rights are being issued. There is a need for better understanding of the Sprague because there is a possible connection there. Glen Spain said there is a fear is that we are moving water from one place to the next and not fixing the problem. Irma Lagomarsino added that this is an important issue. There is concern about groundwater pumping and water banking. The project is being managed based on inflow to Upper Klamath Lake, which determines a

lot downstream. There is a concern that there is an increase in water use. She'd like to see Oregon work with those irrigators to help them understand that they are influencing inflow into Upper Klamath Lake. Reed Marbut disagreed that there is an increase in water usage. Irma Lagomarsino asked how he knew that because there aren't any gages. Reed Marbut replied that they found no illegal uses and there are not a lot of new rights. The only increase in usage is during dry years. Glen Spain summarized that there has been an increase in ground pumping and the concern is that it can't be quantified. Reed Marbut suggested an individual who is participating in the ground water study come talk to the Task Force to answer questions. The Task Force members agreed that this was a good idea.

Assignments: Staff will reserve time for a groundwater discussion on the October Task Force meeting agenda.

Staff will contact an Oregon groundwater hydrologist (contact provided by Reed Marbut) and ask them to give a presentation on the current groundwater situation in Oregon at the October Task Force meeting.

Staff will contact a California groundwater specialist (contact provided by Matt St. John) and ask them to attend the October Task Force meeting for the groundwater discussion.

Agendum 21. Public comment

Marshall Staunton, Tule Lake Farmer and Upper Basin Working Group, said many entities are looking at the Upper Klamath Lake issue, especially Upper Basin Working Group. He mentioned Irma Lagomarsino's California contracting concern with groundwater. He noted that California's groundwater system accounts for years when surface water is delivered. He cautioned discussion on enforcing a restriction on surface water delivery because increases in groundwater pumping can't be predicted. Alfalfa crops increase the use of water too. NRCS did a draft assessment of acreages in the upper basin and a huge part is forested, which provides a good assessment of the amount of farmed land. He provided a table from this NRCS report (agendum 21 handout). He continued that it seems odd that it's ok to build huge dams that have huge effects and we want to punish PacifiCorp for operating a smaller project. It seems that we need to understand the success rate of a reintroduction effort before considering taking the dams out.

Jim Henderson, Karuk Tribe, stated that in response to Marshall Staunton's comments on fish reintroduction studies, the relicensing collaborative is trying to get PacifiCorp to fulfill their commitment to study reintroduction.

Elwood Miller mentioned that rainbow trout are the last and best fishery left in the upper basin and now they are experiencing problems. The tribe is concerned about that.

Agendum 22. Reports from Sub-basin Coordinators on the status of sub-basin planning, coordination, and restoration efforts

a. Scott River Sub-basin (Rhonda Muse, Scott River Watershed Council)

Rhonda Muse introduced herself as coordinator for the Scott River Watershed Council (SRWC). The SRWC has been working on a limiting factor analysis. Limiting factors analysis identifies the critical factors suppressing a population. The objective was to gather information and then develop a list of factors affecting each salmonid life stage. Information includes limiting factor, sub-categories, available studies or information, research needs, opinion from team, and sources of problems. Rhonda Muse listed limiting factors and data and research needs. Step 2 is to prioritize the factors, obtain data, and summarize. She said that a key question is concerning habitat utilization patterns of coho. She asked that folks contact her if they are interested in looking at two draft addendums to the Strategic Action Plan: one on fisheries and a summary of the limiting factors. She listed several actions they are still hoping to complete and identified five project proposals submitted to the Task Force.

b. Shasta River Sub-basin (Dave Webb, Shasta Coordinated Resource Management Planning Committee (CRMP))

Dave Webb introduced himself as the Shasta CRMP coordinator and stated that he appreciates being able to come here. He referenced the restoration accomplishments list since 1988 and other handouts provided to Task Force members (see agendum 22b handout). Some of the accomplishments include: mapping all diversions in the Shasta Valley, working with NRCS to develop guidelines for allocation of the farm bill, assisting CDFG and Humboldt State University in developing and evaluating hydrologic layer of Shasta River for evaluating for coho presence and absence, and assisting in data collection for the TMDL process. Dave Webb mentioned that they will compile an accomplishments report documenting successes over the years. The Shasta CRMP is increasingly thinking about the sun setting Task Force and how they have been key to the success of the organization. John Engbring said accomplishments from the Shasta CRMP would be a great addition to the Task Force's larger accomplishments report.

Questions: Marcia Armstrong commented that the Shasta CRMP attended a Siskiyou Board of Supervisors meeting to explain the groundwater study, which was great. It makes people in the County feel more comfortable because they have a forum to discuss this. Dave Hillemeier asked Dave Webb to please expand on challenges experienced with ranking the projects and getting projects that are for water for saving fish. Dave Webb said a huge problem is that the legislation is written by people who don't understand plumbing of agriculture and watersheds. Another factor is the "use it or lose it" aspect of money that forces funding of every project that comes in until the money is gone. This is difficult because money can't be rolled over to the next year.

c. Salmon River Sub-basin (Jim Villeponteaux, Salmon River Restoration Council (SRRC))

Jim Villeponteaux referred to the handout that he provided (see agendum 22c handout) and listed areas that the SRRC focuses on: fisheries, roads, fuels and fire, noxious weeds, education and outreach, and monitoring. He described some of the restoration projects that went along with some of the SRRC areas of interest including; King Solomon mine tailing reclamation, cooperative planning efforts with the Fire Safe Council, and the Salmon River fish barrier assessment. Jim Villeponteaux mentioned educational outreach and the watershed education program accomplishments and how the noxious weed program is heavily supported by the community. The SRRC is also helping run the Salmon River screw trap and are currently doing flow and temperature monitoring.

d. Mid-Klamath Sub-basin (Will Harling, Karuk Tribe)

Will Harling, Karuk Tribe, said he would like to talk about recent activities of the Karuk Tribe. There is complex land ownership in the area and many stakeholders, which makes sub-basin planning complex. He listed the many coordination groups involved and some of the projects currently in motion, which include: Stanshaw Creek water conservation and thermal refugia improvement project and education and outreach efforts. He noted that the Karuk Department of Natural Resources provides good outreach making it easier to get community buy-in on a lot of the projects. Will Harling mentioned the success of the cooperative restoration efforts. There are a lot of good road removal projects and a lot of good work with the Fire Safe Council. The sub-basin plan working draft was finished in November 2003 and includes a watershed prioritization matrix and incorporates comments from the Technical Work Group and the community.

e. Lower Klamath Sub-basin (Dave Hillemeier for Dan Gale, Yurok Tribe)

Dave Hillemeier mentioned the geographic area of the Lower Klamath sub-basin and that the tributaries have high timber harvest rates, road densities are high, stream crossing is high, and there is extensive stream clearing activities. The Yurok Tribe is continuing to partner with Simpson Timber Company to do watershed analyses. This information helped to develop the Lower Klamath Sub-basin Watershed Restoration Plan that helped prioritize efforts from year to year.

Instream and riparian restoration activities have been conducted in McGarvey Creek, Ah Pah Creek, Blue Creek, and Tectah Creek. Turwar Creek is next because of the good habitat there. There is a huge potential for coho in the lower tributaries. The tribe is continuing watershed assessments and monitoring, conducting fish passage studies in the lower tributaries, studying downstream migrant trapping, coho abundance, reach specific population estimates above and below barriers, and water quality and discharge monitoring. The tribe is also in the process of developing restoration recommendations for the estuary. All of this information feeds into revising the tribe's Lower Basin plan, which is a living document.

John Engbring thanked the sub-basin representatives for providing the Task Force with a better understanding of the on-the-ground work. The progress made is impressive. A goal of the Task Force is to let the local watershed groups make decisions regarding their local areas – these reports have shown that this is successful.

Petey Brucker's Comments to the Task Force

Petey Brucker, as an individual, stated that he believes that in creating the Klamath Act, Congress identified the importance of voluntary efforts because it indicates local cooperation. In developing the Accomplishments Report, we need to capture this to demonstrate the local buy in.

The effort for the spring Chinook is a good example. The Salmon River might have the last of the wild spring Chinook. These are the fish that have probably have taken the biggest hit from dams – there used to be ½ million of them, now only 180 fish. The fact that a Chinook is only a Chinook for management purposes is not an appropriate way to move forward. He invoked a moral imperative a few years to protect spring Chinook and asked people to create a voluntary spring Chinook recovery program. Things are coming along; we are asking people to do what they can, voluntarily. He also mentioned that reports are showing that there is more water coming out of the Salmon River than the upper basin. Gauges in places like the Salmon River are important.

Ron Reed added that in the fish die-off reconnaissance effort we found one spring Chinook above the Salmon River and it wasn't in good condition. Chuck Blackburn commented that the Rogue River is mostly spring Chinook, few fall run. Glen Spain said that its probably due to the impacts of the dams on the Klamath. Steve West added that he was impressed with all of the five sub-basin presentations. He suggested giving these presentations on public access television.

Agendum 23. Task Force Decision on 2005 Work Plan

John Engbring opened up the floor for comments and thoughts on the 2005 work plan, projects recommended for funding by the Budget Committee, as described in agendum 15, above. Marcia Armstrong said she spoke with the Scott River Watershed Council and they prefer their two year funding of \$25,000 go toward the riparian restoration analysis, which is their number one priority. The national riparian team came out and looked that the valley and it was clear that they need to reestablish native plants. She would like to have permission to allocate \$25,000 from PC-06 to HP-04. Marcia Armstrong continued that more than half of the budget is going toward monitoring for the harvest mega-table, it would be nice if there was other funding for this. John Engbring said KFMC does not have their own budget for collecting harvest information and the Task Force has always given some money towards that in addition to restoration.

John Engbring asked about the riparian restoration analysis. Petey Brucker responded that they want to prioritize the best locations for riparian restoration. He added that the purpose of the analysis was to see what has happened, what did and did not work, and to identify future needs.

Ron Reed apologized for not being able to attend the Budget Committee meeting. He said FP-13 is a very important project to the Karuk Tribe and it is not funded. The reason it is important is that it is to monitor the wild stock component. He asked the reasoning behind that decision. Petey Brucker replied that there were a number of harvest model proposals

that came in and we could not fund them all. John Engbring clarified that the reason this proposal wasn't funded was because the number of Chinook salmon surveyed was much less than came out of the other surveys. Ron Reed said he agrees, but Bogus Creek is right next to the hatchery and is hatchery influenced. He suggested USGS use their own money to fund the SALMOD project (FP-05) in order to free up money for tribal trust management process. Dave Hillemeier supported funding FP-13 fully, funding FP-05 for \$8,000 and sending a letter to USGS suggesting they get other funding elsewhere. USGS should continue to fund SALMOD as they have in past years.

Marcia Armstrong added that there is no funding for education this year and the Collier Interpretive Center needs assistance. She added that the deficit irrigation of alfalfa study also needs to be funded, but we don't have enough funds. The Task Force agreed that there is a need for funding at the Collier Interpretive Center. Ron Reed will see if the Karuk Tribe can provide assistance, and Petey said he would promote it with the Siskiyou County Resource Advisory Committee.

Dave Hillemeier said that FP-12 is taking a hit. There are new proposers as a part of this. He recommends the previous survey areas and funders be prioritized and these entities be funded in the same proportions as last year.

Marcia Armstrong suggested that some letters be written to agencies asking that they re-assume funding of these harvest monitoring studies.

Motion by Marcia Armstrong for staff to draft a letter to USFWS, USGS, CDFG, USFS, and the Secretary of Commerce, emphasizing the importance of resuming funding for studies in support of the mega-table and harvest information. Finding this funding is especially important because, after 2006, Task Force funding will not be available to cover these costs.

Seconded by Glen Spain.

Motion passed unanimously.

Motion by Chuck Blackburn to accept the Budget Committee's recommendation on the 2005 Work Plan with the following exceptions:

- **Reduce funding to FP-05 to allocate \$22,561 to FP-13 and \$5,000 towards development of an Accomplishments Report and leave the remainder of the original \$35,973 for FP-05 (\$8,412)**
- **Re-allocate \$25,000 from PC-06 to HP-04**
- **Re-allocate \$5,000 from HR-04 towards an Accomplishments Report.**

Seconded by Marcia Armstrong.

Motion passed unanimously.

Motion by Dave Hillemeier for Staff to draft a letter to USGS suggesting they allocate as much funding to SALMOD as they did last year due to its importance and because they are getting more funds for the Klamath Basin next year.

Seconded by Glen Spain

Motion passed unanimously.

Agendum 24. Public comment

Dave Webb, Shasta CRMP, complimented the Task Force on a good discussion to get to the funding decision.

Agendum 25. Recap and identify agenda to include in the next meeting

John Engbring recapped agenda items for the October meeting: USGS and DWR presentation on groundwater studies, sun setting priorities, and section dredging presentations.

Agendum 26. Next meeting is in Yreka, October 13-14, 2004. We need to schedule the February, June, and October meetings in 2005

The Task Force discussed future meeting dates.

- February 9-10th, 2005 possibly in Crescent City at the Elk Valley Rancheria or in Brookings, Oregon.
- June 15th-16th, 2005 in Yreka.
- October 19-20th, 2005 in Klamath Falls.

Steve West mentioned a new book out that discussed collaboration and consensus, “Western Confluence” by Dr, Matt McKinney and William Harmon. The first chapter is on the Klamath.

The meeting was adjourned.

KLAMATH RIVER BASIN FISHERIES TASK FORCE MEETING

***June 23 - 24, 2004
Shilo Inn
Klamath Falls, Oregon***

FINAL AGENDA

June 23, 2004

1. Convene and opening remarks. John Engbring, Chair. Vice Chair is Allen Foreman, Klamath Tribes. Vice Chair for next meeting will be Allen Foreman.
2. Introductions of Congressional staff in attendance
3. Business
 - a. Approval of minutes
 - b. Adoption of agenda
 - c. Report on Draft Addenda to the Long Range Plan resulting from Task Force review of recommendations from Mid-term Evaluation (Ronnie Pierce and Laurie Simons)
 - d. Suggestion that the Task Force consider regularly agendizing presentations from timber, farming, and fisher communities to air concerns (Chuck Blackburn)
4. Brief review of last meeting actions/general correspondence/program update (Laurie Simons)
5. Brief Updates and Announcements
 - a. Update on State coho recovery process (Neil Manji)
 - b. Update on Shasta-Scott Recovery Team (Neil Manji)
 - c. Update on NOAA coho recovery planning (Irma Lagomarsino)
 - d. Update on NOAA hatchery listing policy (Irma Lagomarsino)
6. Report from the Technical Work Group: progress on Task Force assignments (Petey Brucker)
 - a. Prioritized list of project proposals for 2005 funding
 - b. Sub-basin planning summary
 - c. Mainstem Sub-basin Planning: Need Task Force decision/direction on how to move forward on Mainstem issues (Handout)
7. Report from Klamath Watershed Coordination Group (Neil Manji and Dave Hillemeier)
Klamath Basin Compact Commission (Alice Kilham)
Upper Klamath Basin Working Group (Jim Carpenter)
8. Presentation on the Trinity River Restoration Program: How it functions and recent issues (Doug Schleusner, BOR)
9. Public comment

Lunch

10. Planning for Klamath Project Operations and status of the Conservation Implementation Program (Christine Karas, BOR)

11. Presentation on Iron Gate Hatchery tagging and mitigation numbers (Linda Prendergast, PacifiCorp; and Neil Manji, California Department of Fish and Game)

12. Report on outcomes of the Lower Klamath River Basin Science Conference (Irma Lagomarsino)

Break

13. Progress of development of the Collier Rest Area Interpretive Displays (Bob Rice)

14. Updates

- a. Proposal to prepare Accomplishments Report for Klamath River Basin Conservation Area Restoration Program (Phil Detrich)
- b. Klamath River Fish Health Assessment Team Report (Neil Manji)

15. Report from Budget Committee on proposed 2005 Work Plan

16. Presentation on harvest management by the Klamath Fishery Management Council (Phil Detrich, Dave Bitts, Keith Wilkinson, Dave Hillemeier)

17. Public comment

Recess

Social Hour – Join us at the bar at Antonio’s Cucina Italiana, 1012 Main Street and/or go on a field trip (5:30 – 6:30 pm) to see the A-canal fish screen with Christine Karas, BOR and then join us at Antonio’s.

June 24, 2004

18. Report from Arcata Fish and Wildlife Office on Flow Study and other field studies (Randy Brown)

19. Klamath River TMDL development status (David Leland, North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board - TMDL Development Unit lead; and Steve Kirk, Oregon Department of Environmental Quality - Klamath Basin Coordinator)

20. Water appropriation issues in the Klamath River Basin in relation to anadromous fisheries restoration (Reed Marbut, Oregon Water Resources Department)

21. Public comment

Break

22. Reports from Sub-basin Coordinators on the status of sub-basin planning, coordination, and restoration efforts

- a. Scott River Sub-basin (Rhonda Muse, SRWC)
- b. Shasta River Sub-basin (Dave Webb, Shasta CRMP)
- c. Salmon River Sub-basin (Jim Villeponteaux, SRRC)
- d. Mid-Klamath Sub-basin (Will Harling, Karuk Tribe)
- e. Lower Klamath Sub-basin (Dan Gale, Yurok Tribe)

23. Task Force Decision on 2005 Work Plan
24. Public comment
25. Recap and identify agenda to include in the next meeting
26. Next meeting is in Yreka, October 13-14, 2004. We need to schedule the February, June, and October meetings in 2005.

Adjourn

KLAMATH RIVER BASIN FISHERIES TASK FORCE MEETING

***June 23-24, 2004
Shilo Inn
Klamath Falls, Oregon***

LIST OF HANDOUTS

Agendum 3c	Long Range Plan Revisions Draft, dated April 29, 2004
Agendum 3c	Original Excerpt from Long Range Plan, Chapter 8, Step-Down Structure of the Restoration Program's Long Range Plan
Agendum 3c	Edited Excerpt from Long Range Plan, Chapter 8, Step-Down Structure of the Restoration Program's Long Range Plan
Agendum 4	Letter to John Engbring, Chair, Klamath River Basin Fisheries Task Force, from John W. Keys, III, Commissioner, BOR, regarding the October 17, 2003, letter to Secretary Gale Norton regarding the BOR's Klamath River Basin Conservation Implementation Program, dated March 23, 2004
Agendum 4	Letter to Honorable Magalie R. Salas, Secretary, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, from the Klamath River Basin Fisheries Task Force regarding PacifiCorp Klamath River Hydroelectric Project FERC-2082, dated April 23, 2004
Agendum 4	E-mail on Status of Klamath Gauge Funding from James Bowers, USGS, June 21, 2004
Agendum 6a	Draft Ranking of Fiscal Year 2005 Task Force Proposals from the Technical Work Group
Agendum 6a	Technical Work Group Report on Assignment Prepared by Petey Brucker
Agendum 6b	Draft Limiting Factors Analysis for Salmon River Spring Chinook Salmon in the Salmon River Watershed/Subbasin
Agendum 6c	Draft – TF Clarification of Mainstem Subbasin plan
Agendum 7	Beyond Crisis to Consensus. Klamath Stakeholders' Conversation & Coordination Workshop
Agendum 11	Department of Fish and Game of the State of California vs. Federal Power Commission; Pacific Power and Light Company, 1966. Appendixes to Petition for a Writ of Certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

Agendum 11a	Iron Gate Hatchery Adult Chinook Returns 1962-2003, California Department of Fish and Game.
Agendum 11a	Iron Gate Hatchery Production Goals and Constraints, California Department of Fish and Game and Pacific Power and Light Company.
Agendum 14a	Shorter Accomplishments Report Outline
Agendum 14a	Draft Larger Accomplishments Report Outline
Agendum 14b	Klamath River Fish Mortality Reconnaissance Survey, from Neil Manji, California Department of Fish and Game
Agendum 15	Klamath River Basin Conservation Area Restoration Program Draft Budget Expenditures, FY 1989 through FY 2003
Agendum 15	Klamath River Basin Conservation Area Restoration Program Klamath Act FY 2005 Budget Allocation, Draft June 2004
Agendum 15 (revised)	Klamath River Basin Conservation Area Restoration Program Klamath Act FY 2005 Budget Allocation, Revised June 2004
Agendum 17	Klamath River Flow. Flow at Keno to compute Lake Ewauna Accretion
Agendum 19	Klamath Basin Total Maximum Daily Loads Fact Sheet
Agendum 20	Water Appropriation Issues in the Klamath River Basin in Relation to Anadromous Fisheries Restoration. Oregon Water Resource Department, June 23-24, 2004
Agendum 21	Upper Klamath Basin – Rapid Subbasin Assessment Summary – May 28, 2003. Provided by Marshall Staunton from a draft assessment by USGS.
Agendum 22b	Shasta CRMP Report to the Klamath River Basin Fishery Task Force June, 2004
Agendum 22b	Shasta River Watershed, from Dave Webb, Shasta CRMP
Agendum 22c	Salmon River Restoration Council Accomplishments Summary, June 2004. Overview of Coordination, Planning and Implementation
Informational	United States Department of Commerce News Release regarding NOAA Fisheries Expresses Continued Commitment to Pacific Salmon Recovery with New Hatchery Policy, dated May 28, 2004

KLAMATH RIVER BASIN FISHERIES TASK FORCE MEETING***June 23-24, 2004******Shilo Inn******Klamath Falls, Oregon******LIST OF ATTENDEES***

The following individuals attended the Klamath River Basin Fisheries Task Force meeting in Klamath Falls, Oregon, on the dates indicated:

June 23, 2004

<u>Name</u>	<u>Organization</u>
Darla Eastman	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Glen Spain	Pacific Coast Federation of Fishermen's Association
Jim Carpenter	Upper Klamath Basin Working Group
Peter Townley	U.S. Department of Agriculture – Natural Resources Conservation Service
Kim Rushton	California Department of Fish and Game (Iron Gate Hatchery)
Mike Dammarell	Bureau of Indian Affairs
Bryant Vogt	Lava Beds – Butte Valley Resource Conservation District
Jim Henderson	Karuk Tribe of California
Mike Polmateer	Karuk Tribe of California
Gail Ottoman	Private
Anita Ward	Upper Klamath Basin Working Group
Terry Norton	Upper Klamath Basin Working Group
Sue Mattenberger	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service – Klamath Basin Ecosystem Restoration Office
Chuck Blackburn	Del Norte County Board of Supervisors
Tam Moore	Capital Press
Doug Schleusner	Trinity River Restoration Program
Earl Danosky	Tulelake Irrigation District
Denise Buck	Oregon State University Extension Klamath County
Marshall Staunton	Upper Klamath Basin Working Group Tulelake Farmer
Christine Karas	U.S. Bureau of Reclamation – Klamath Basin Area Office
Ron Hathaway	Oregon State University
Bob Gearheart	Humboldt State University
Ron Reed	Karuk Tribe
Petey Brucker	Technical Work Group
Bob Rice	Collier Interpretive and Information Center
David A. Ross	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service – Klamath Basin Ecosystem Restoration Office
Reed Marbut	Oregon Water Resources Department
Dan Keppen	Klamath Water User's Association
Dylan J. Darling	Herald and News

June 24, 2004

<u>Name</u>	<u>Organization</u>
Mike Polmateer	Karuk Tribe of California
Matt St. John	North Coast Water Quality Control Board
Glen Spain	Pacific Coast Federation of Fishermen's Association
Bryan Vogt	Lava Beds – Butte Valley Resource Conservation District
Jim Villeponteaux	Salmon River Restoration Council
Philip Jackson	Klamath Tribes
Steve Kirk	Oregon Department of Environmental Quality
Curt Mullis	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service/Klamath Basin Ecosystem Restoration Office
Dave Salem	Klamath Irrigation District
Terry Norton	Upper Klamath Basin Working Group
Mike Dammarell	Bureau of Indian Affairs- Northwest Regional Office
Dylan J. Darling	Herald and News
Will Harling	Karuk Tribe of California
Jim Henderson	Karuk Tribe of California
Petey Brucker	Salmon River Restoration Council/Technical Work Group
David Webb	Shasta Coordinated Resource Management Planning Committee
Anita Ward	Upper Klamath Basin Working Group
David Leland	North Coast Resource Water Quality Control Board
Rhonda Muse	Scott River Watershed Council

KLAMATH RIVER BASIN FISHERIES TASK FORCE MEETING

***June 23-24, 2004
Shilo Inn
Klamath Falls, CA***

MOTIONS AND ASSIGNMENTS

Motions:

Agendum 3a

Motion by Steve West to approve the February minutes with edits provided by Marcia Armstrong.

Seconded by Marcia Armstrong.

Abstentions by Keith Wilkinson, Elwood Miller, and Neil Manji.

Motion passed unanimously.

Agendum 3b

Motion by Keith Wilkinson to adopt the agenda.

Seconded by Glen Spain.

Motion passed unanimously.

Agendum 4

Motion by Dave Hillemeier for staff to draft a letter to USGS requesting full funding for the Salmon River gauge, with copies to DWR and USFS. The letter should identify cost sharing options for DWR and USGS.

Seconded by Glen Spain.

Motion passed unanimously.

Agendum 23

Motion by Marcia Armstrong for staff to draft a letter to USFWS, USGS, CDFG, USFS, and the Secretary of Commerce, emphasizing the importance of resuming funding for studies in support of the mega-table and harvest information. Finding this funding is especially important because, after 2006, Task Force funding will not be available to cover these costs.

Seconded by Glen Spain.

Motion passed unanimously.

Motion by Chuck Blackburn to accept the Budget Committee's recommendation on the 2005 Work Plan with the following exceptions:

- Reduce funding to FP-05 to allocate \$22,561 to FP-13 and \$5,000 towards development of an Accomplishments Report and leave the remainder of the original \$35,973 for FP-05 (\$8,412)
- Re-allocate \$25,000 from PC-06 to HP-04
- Re-allocate \$5,000 from HR-04 towards an Accomplishments Report.

Seconded by Marcia Armstrong.

Motion passed unanimously.

Motion by Dave Hillemeier for Staff to draft a letter to USGS suggesting they allocate as much funding to SALMOD as they did last year due to its importance and because they are getting more funds for the Klamath Basin next year.

Seconded by Glen Spain

Motion passed unanimously.

Assignments:

Agendum 3c

Staff will email the edited version of the Long Range Plan, including Addenda 1 and 2, to Task Force members and Kier and Associates to incorporate in their web copy of the Long Range Plan. The Addenda will also be submitted to FERC for their Klamath Project relicensing process.

Agendum 6c

Staff will include an edited version of the Draft Mainstem Sub-basin Plan Outline provided by Dave Hillemeier and Julie Perrochet on the October agenda for Task Force members to consider as an assignment to the TWG or an RFP to fund in the next funding cycle.

Agendum 14b

Staff will include the 2006 Budget on the October Task Force meeting agenda for discussion.

Agendum 20

Staff will reserve time for a groundwater discussion on the October Task Force meeting agenda.

Staff will contact an Oregon groundwater hydrologist (contact provided by Reed Marbut) and ask them to give a presentation on the current groundwater situation in Oregon at the October Task Force meeting.

Staff will contact a California groundwater specialist (contact provided by Matt St. John) and ask them to attend the October Task Force meeting for the groundwater discussion.